

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, and 15, and claims 1-18 are now pending in this Application, of which claims 1, 8, and 15 are independent.

The amendments to the claims find support, for example, in paragraphs [0035-38] of the specification.

No new matter has been added.

§ 103 REJECTIONS

The Office Action dated December 23, 2008, rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown, U.S. Patent No. 6,754,211, in view of Roy et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,246,682, further in view of Basu et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,288,971. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims overcome these rejections.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method of replicating multicast datagrams in a network device, said method comprising:

- determining by a memory management unit whether a scheduled outgoing datagram stored in a main memory is a multicast (MC) packet;
- when the scheduled outgoing datagram type is the MC datagram:
 - performing a lookup of a replicate count table to determine a copy count value that represents a number of copies that have been generated to duplicate a particular packet and writing the copy count value to a copy count register;
 - populating a count field based on a number of equal cost paths for each Internet Protocol (IP) route for the packet;
 - randomly choosing one of the equal cost paths for the packet;
- sending the outgoing datagram to the egress port from the main memory along with the copy count value and route information for the chosen equal cost path;
- changing the copy count value in the copy count register;
- modifying a VLAN identifier of the outgoing datagram if necessary based on the copy count value; and
- forwarding the outgoing datagram from the egress port.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references discloses, “populating a count field based on a number of equal cost paths for each Internet Protocol (IP) route for the packet; randomly choosing one of the equal cost paths for the packet; [and] sending the outgoing datagram to the egress port from the main memory along with the copy count value and route information for the chosen equal cost path,” as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Applicant further requests that the rejections of claims 2-7 be withdrawn at least due to their dependence on claim 1.

Applicant further requests that the rejections of claims 8-18 be withdrawn for substantially similar reasons as those described above.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests notification to that effect. The Examiner may telephone Applicant's attorney (208-286-1013) to facilitate prosecution of this Application. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3521, referencing Attorney Docket No. 0063-104001.

Respectfully submitted,

Brake Hughes Bellermann LLP
Phone 208-286-1013

Date March 23, 2009

By: /Shane A. Kennedy/
Shane A. Kennedy
Reg. No. 54,760